

LSTA Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
WLA Headquarters, Madison, November 16-17, 2010

**Tuesday, November 16**

**Present:** Dee Barabe, Steve Platteter, Pat Chevis, Jeff Dawson, Garrett Erickson, Becki George, Joan Johnson, Terri Iverson, Leah Langby, Pat Laughlin, Deb Kabler, Tasha Saecker, Michael Sheehan, and Lynn Stainbrook.

**Absent:** Bob Stack

**Division Staff:** Kurt Kiefer, Mike Cross, Nancy Anderson, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, John DeBacher.

**Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions**

The meeting started at 10:02. Howe greeted committee members and asked them to introduce themselves.

**Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Howe welcomed the group, had participants introduce themselves to the new Assistant Superintendent, Kurt Kiefer. He welcomed the group, told of his love of libraries and reading, and his past on the “dark side” as public school IT and data management. He likes numbers, tracking use of information, and helping libraries tell the stories about what is happening in the libraries.

Howe reviewed the arrangement of the packet, and her experiment with Google Docs.

**Review of the Agenda**

Howe reviewed the changed order of the agenda.

**Public Hearing**

Howe reviewed letters submitted:

- John Thompson requested e-content funds for downloadable books and audio, with a partnership of the state and system consortium (WPLC). Demand has outstripped resources. Funding at \$200,000 range suggested. He suggested an increase in the “Enhancing use of Technology,” including language to allow additional members to join existing shared systems.
- He submitted a second letter on the topic of libraries joining shared automated systems.
- Walter Burkhalter submitted a letter also requesting support to enhance and strengthen the offerings of Overdrive.

**LSTA Coordinator’s Report**

Howe reported that there is uncertainty about how LSTA funding is released, with recurring delays. She expressed concern that the final reports on grants are not reviewing or reflecting the project’s original objectives and that may have a negative effect on our standing with IMLS. Next year’s grants will be subject to greater reporting requirements, particularly for grants over \$25,000. The new guidelines have

not yet been issued. Kiefer first reported this greater financial scrutiny discussion following COSLA meetings. Howe said the new directives are part of the Funding Accountability and Transparency Act.

### **Approval of Minutes of the April 2010 meeting**

Dawson moved, supported by Sheehan, to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

### **LSTA Application Overview**

Cross reviewed the process for review of the categories and proposed projects. He stressed that there is greater scrutiny of projects at the federal level. We will be making a more concerted effort to ensure that projects are well thought out with a greater chance of success. We have a new sanction policy that may need to be invoked if necessary. Grant administrators need to report on the original objectives of the grant, with required reporting. If inappropriate activities are conducted, funds may need to be recovered and returned. In the future, project reports will be posted and made available publicly on the federal IMLS website.

Cross directed members to the LSTA manual and particularly the conflict-of-interest policy on page 23 and asked if there were questions or concerns. He referred participants to the need for abstention, discussion and non-action for members who are directly involved in projects. Cross indicated that the recommendations of the committee are valued and forwarded to the State Superintendent.

Cross reviewed the budget spreadsheet. He noted the addition of a category for an E-Books Summit and Content Licensing, which is a new item proposed by the Division. He discussed issues and the possibility of funding changes, since no action has been taken, except the recommendation by the administration for flat funding of LSTA. He noted that the carryover amount is an estimate, with \$175,000 available for next year's projects. He suggested that the committee not feel obligated to allocate every dollar. He also indicated that total requests exceed available funds by more than \$53,000. He reviewed the process for the second day with the budget to be projected on a screen and adjusted as changes are made. He also referred the committee to the budget spreadsheet for internal DLTCL projects.

### **Internal Operations and Statewide Projects**

#### *Broadband*

Bocher reported on the Broadband Upgrade budget request and the possible need for additional support at locations for upgrades or improvements to help offset costs required for the fiber upgrades. The amount set is \$15,000 as a reserve.

#### *Communication and Planning*

Cross reviewed the \$20,000 requested for LITAC, COLAND and other meetings and conferences, as well as COSLA meetings. Kiefer assured the group of the impact that the COSLA (Chief Officers of State Library Agencies) meeting in Kansas City had on him. He said that the discussion at the national level on e-resources led to internal discussions on meeting needs. Howe said she would post the e-book study that COSLA had carried out. Laughlin asked if just the state librarians attend, or others. Staff reviewed who had attended in Grobschmidt's absence in recent years. Kiefer said the whole digital reader/content issue indicates that libraries should try to shape their future as much as possible. Drew reported on some of the other issues regarding digital content and materials for the blind and physically handicapped. Johnson asked if other types of libraries are discussed and he indicated yes. Cross talked about the IMLS reauthorization process and that COSLA has been pushing Congress on the issue.

#### *Delivery Projects (SCLS, NWLS)*

Drew reported that the amount and purpose has no changes from what was presented in the spring, amounts to subsidize the backbone costs for the systems and to provide conveyance up to NWLS.

*Learning Express*

The amount requested is what is required to fund the project through June 30, 2011. The continued funding has been included in the DPI budget request; where it goes beyond that (Department of Administration) remains to be seen, and may be delayed with a new Governor. The state budget request includes new funding for Learning Express as well as funding for the Wisconsin Newspaper collection. The requests need to clear through the DOA process for further consideration. Laughlin asked if it is on BadgerLink right now (yes) and whether the amount is for future use. Drew indicated that this amount has been encumbered and needs to be reflected in the LSTA budget. Laughlin said that locally she is paying for another product but that they could save considerably by switching to this product. Stainbrook asked if there is statistics available comparing use of Learning Express to other BadgerLink databases, since she has seen popularity in her library. Having use numbers may be able to help support future funding. Kiefer suggested collecting numbers of how many libraries previously had spent, as well as for other similar projects, and be able to show savings at the local level for resources available statewide. Laughlin stressed also that her library, and many others, no longer buy print resources in this area; only electronic resources, and that it would be better to have consistent resources.

Cross asked what the schools have experienced using Learning Express since some do career preparation and could use them. George and Barabe reflected that they have exposed schools in their areas to Learning Express.

*Library Improvement: Technology*

Cross reported that the category supports Bocher's position, his CE, and the annual meeting of technology coordinators. He noted that the sharp decrease in his salary funding is a result of the Online Opportunity grant funds from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Laughlin asked whether any of the Gates money is for administration costs. The answer is yes.

*LSTA Administration*

Howe noted that the category has increased only slightly and added that the amount is limited by the IMLS.

*Public Library Development: Library Improvement*

Mike reviewed the internal expenditures and proposed changes for the category, affected by vacancies and job cuts within the Division. 80% of Cross position, 100% of Huntington's position, and for a 50% position for data collection. It also funds statewide meeting for system directors, youth and special needs consultants, and continuing education meetings. It also covers some continuing education for staff other than Bocher.

Langby asked if there is still a hiring freeze. Cross said that budget issues more often affect hiring issues. Cross indicated that two GPR positions were lost. One may be filled, though next year's budget looks bleaker. Kiefer said the process has been expedited but there is uncertainty.

*Resources for Libraries & Lifelong Learning*

Drew noted that their name has changed to recognize that they do library things, but their role as an agency with a large collection is more limited. They are re-evaluating the collection and what resources they reasonably can keep. They would like to put more of their energy into electronic information. Their website was revised to indicate their new emphases. Two changes were made by changes two library assistants to librarian positions, but the change will not make a huge difference initially. More staff into BadgerLink program, their highest-cost program, but formerly with only one staff person. They would like to make the website more usable and functional. There will also be more work with digital projects. LITAC asked that a database of training materials be developed and maintained, but they will need

resources to carry that out. Overall, less time being spent on ILL; working more toward converting ILL to an automated process.

#### *School Library Media Summit*

Nancy Anderson thanked the group for allocating the funds. They have had good people come to work at the summit in April, with a vision (not necessarily unanimous) that led to a workgroup in June to develop a vision that was adopted, with visions for students, for the media program, and a vision. The four action teams resulting led to the projects being carried out currently. She reviewed those continuing efforts that should result in products and goals. WEMTA and WLA have been supportive. Funding in the next year will allow group meetings to continue. A second summit may or may not be necessary.

Sheehan asked if the web site discussed is very far along. Anderson said, no, that the action teams are still debating the goals and mission statements so that concrete results could be reflected. Laughlin said there was controversy when it was discussed in April, but wondered what the state of affairs is for public school librarians, since it is dismal in her own area. Anderson said it is not good, but, in a nutshell, the budget crunch has affected library positions in schools, so this discussion and focus has been appreciated. Laughlin said that local library boards have been struggling with local schools that have discontinued support for their school librarians, leaving a void that public libraries are not always able to fill. Kiefer said that we believe that the child must drive the outcome—what 21<sup>st</sup> century skills they need, and what resources that can carry that out requires planning and focus. Anderson added that the work of the library media specialist is being focused on. DeBacher asked about the title “school librarian.”

Howe asked what the four areas of investigation were. Anderson responded that the groups were:

- Communication
- Staffing models
- Accountability role of the school librarian for evaluation of the program and person
- Licensure of teachers and administrators to include technology skills. School librarians need to communicate and be able to use resources.

#### *Statewide Library Access*

They had originally hired George Watson, and his report recommended a demonstration project in the northeastern part of the state with the New Era system. They allow anyone in the community to get a library card, so it seemed to be a good site. A planning group discussed awarding grant in that area. Two surveys of actual users will be done. St. Norbert has been contracted for this purpose. They will discuss what needs to be done in addition to what they currently do, and how that might serve as a state model. Where any staffing required is still under consideration. One drawback was that the New Era group hadn't had a meeting for some time, which indicated that an advisory committee for this project might serve them well longer-term. They will determine what has worked and what hasn't, and what issues should be considered moving on. A fund will be established to pay for lost books, but Drew thought that might better be administered by RL&LL. Ken Frazier at UW-Libraries also talked to George Watson about the varying levels of open access among the UW system campuses. Nearly all campuses, except in the New Era area of NE Wisconsin, now charge at some level for cards to borrow from their collections. More work will need to be done to get buy-in for access without fees. Howe asked whether the issue will address electronic resources and access. The staff person hired will need to investigate that at each location, but the vendor licenses may drive that issue. Stainbrook asked if there is any physical safety concern among the universities for access to the collection. Drew said that may be an issue in the rest of the state, but not in the New Era region. Laughlin asked if there is any funding in the statewide delivery system to pay for lost or damaged materials. Drew said the borrowing library has a responsibility to accommodate that—if there is a problem, then she needs to know. Laughlin said more

than \$2000 may be required for lost/damaged materials. Johnson asked who would consider the results of this project. Drew assured her that COLAND is following it very closely with great interest.

*Meeting broke for lunch at 12 noon and resumed at 1 p.m.*

#### *Virtual Reference*

Drew reported that costs actually remained the same as they had been the previous year. They are now working on a Spanish language queue with Milwaukee and some other libraries providing time. They have been promoting to schools, but there are so many schools. They have included 30 schools, incorporating training and indoctrination with school staff.

Laughlin asked about the number of individual libraries that participated. She wondered how many have answered questions. Drew said they do not know how many are addressed by individual libraries. They have tried to understand the statistics. She said they are disappointed with the level of statistics that come out of the project.

#### *WISCAT*

Drew commented on funding levels requested. She discussed changes with Autographics and efforts to increase the scope of the virtual catalog. They will no longer do authority control on it, which will save \$45,000 per year. Integration with Iliad, and experiments with WorldCat are progressing. Stainbrook noted that there are exciting features with some of the other projects, but she doesn't understand what the future is for WISCAT, or what might be unique or necessary five years from now. Drew acknowledged that the shared ILSs are taking care of much of ILL for public library systems and for the academic community, but there is still coordination between those systems. In the future, if they can automate more of the activity between systems, that will result in savings. She is interested in seeing Southwest Library System's adoption of Autographics' product for the ILS to see how well an ideal integration can work. The work with Sirsi-Dynix has waxed and waned, and currently their interest has been very low. Platteter said he has heard rumors that they are interested again. Stainbrook suggested, then that in five years there will be a tool to include ILL to automate the resource sharing process. If there were a statewide ILS, this project would not be needed. However, by integrating ILS's with WISCAT, there is considerable savings. Stainbrook questioned the level of activity and the relatively high cost per loan. She wondered whether the costs would decrease or increase. Drew said she did not see any reason that costs would necessarily decrease, but that savings could be realized in staff time both for RL&LL and the libraries using the service. Platteter clarified what their system does and when they use WISCAT, and that they had tried the NCIP integration. WISCAT allows requests to be conducted among all types of libraries. They are now also sending requests out-of-state though WISCAT among other states that use similar systems. Stainbrook recalled figures that Peter Hamon used about the costs to share materials among libraries within a system are considerably lower, at about \$.29 per transaction. DeBacher explained some of what was revealed in an Evergreen white paper, showing that savings in efficiency are more than offset by increases in demand. He felt that in some cases users may request materials and, by not having a librarian involved, overlook resources at hand or more easily obtained, and that could have a collateral cost in higher delivery, demand among different types of libraries, etc.

#### *E-Books*

Cross explained that the intent is to both learn, through some kind of a forum or summit, the issues and challenges of broadening offerings of e-resources to libraries throughout the state, and also have some funds in order to increase the level of content. He opened up the topic to Kiefer who reiterated that a national dialog is occurring and that we need to have one at the state level, since it is a fundamental and critical issue. He wonders if there are other mechanisms that might help improve both the distribution of materials and the delivery of services. Having a context for discussion would be useful, and it serves as a follow-up to the summit two years ago, involving all the stakeholders. Determine where we are on the issues and where we need to go.

Stainbrook said that, in some respects, that the state law hampers libraries, but also provides an opportunity to provide something statewide (the same-services requirements for systems). She has talked to Overdrive and Freegal both, but the cost to have those available throughout the system as opposed to just her county is simply cost prohibitive. She feels that something must be done now, or the library community will be left behind. She is nervous when she hears that “this library in your state is doing that” and really wonders how legal their activity is. Now Overdrive offers download stations in the library, but previously only remote access was permitted. She has heard that Kindles have been used but that Amazon may not be condoning that kind of services. She agrees that we need to think on a grand scale. Sheehan thinks it will also help to bring some pressure on the vendors to accommodate libraries and their needs.

Drew reported that LITAC has discussed the topic over the last few meetings. Some was reported in Channel. They have discussed some of the same issues—statewide access versus local, but have talked about the need to bring in a lot more people. Instead of just an addition to BadgerLink, but have a different system that can manage the materials better. She said there are lots of full works in BadgerLink, but they are designed to be accessed as a non-fiction reference, and they are not designed for download or portable use. She said there may be some portion of what local libraries spend on their own materials that may need to be incorporated as well. It becomes a different type of contract negotiation. Platteter noted that WPLC has done a great job with Overdrive, but that is not what WPLC was designed for as a consortium. Laughlin said that audio book use has always been affected by what happened in the car industry. Now it is driven by the hand-held industry. But the audience of the local library should not be lost, and we do lots of service to the elderly and the seniors, who are still reliant on cassettes. George said that she hopes there will be discussion for school libraries, since they are facing similar challenges. Huntington mentioned the need to mention the disproportional amount of adult materials versus juvenile materials. Kiefer said he talked to CCBC, and wonders if they may become the hybrid of print materials. Saecker said that Overdrive drives her insane and continues to, as much as they have tried to accommodate the audience.

## **Discussion and Review of 2010 LSTA Applications**

### **External Grant Categories – competitive and noncompetitive**

#### *Accessibility*

Huntington reviewed the types of projects that have been conducted, and the current proposals. She noted that she often needs to get involved. Dane County is using iPads with people with dementia. The format works very well for navigation—the iPad can help to prompt discussion and memories. WVLS will incorporate a Loop system for auditory. Winding River will use a new Loop system for around the Reference Desk to provide more normal level conversation with hearing aid patrons. Stevens Point asked for a loop for their meeting room, but also for carpeting, which would not be allowed, so she recommends funding that at \$6500 instead of the full amount. Stainbrook said that most of the abstracts had population integrated, but that was not indicated here. She wondered how many may use the meeting rooms, whether that would justify equipping the meeting rooms. NWLS had a project to install large-screen monitors for their libraries.

#### *Job Search, Training and Support*

Huntington noted that there is a problem with the Arrowhead project that needs to be resolved. Also one with Indianhead in how salary would be used in the grant, but that would need to be taken care of subsequent to the committee meeting. The New Berlin also had a possible issue with capital expenditures, but she cannot discern whether the costs included two workstations, whereas the guidelines specify one only (although occasionally a laptop for portable trainings). The desk, chair and window treatments, and it is difficult to tell what expenses are disallowed. She will need to work with the library to clarify the application. Her assessment is that, of the total \$7000, \$4000 is in capital

expenses. Subtracted one workstation, the window treatments, etc. the total would be \$3950. Otherwise she has no problem with the grant.

#### *Literacy*

Huntington discussed Marinette's jail project. They included outreach by the library at over \$3000, which is not allowed for a full-time employee. She recommends \$5205 to discount that amount. The Polk County project has considerable staff costs as well that must be resolved. The entire funding requested is for \$23,000 for salaries and wages. Stainbrook asked why the clarification must happen subsequently. She wondered if the committee could ask staff to answer the question by tomorrow. Whether that is appropriate was discussed. Some of the committee wondered whether they could see the comments. Stainbrook wondered about the supplanting issue. Cross suggested that there may not be sufficient information included in the application to warrant funding the grant.

#### *Digitization: Local Resources*

Drew discussed the Winnebago project, that they had previously done some in a previous project, but that this current project is not enthusiastic about some conversion that would be required before digitization is done. However, our guidelines do not cover that kind of work. There is also an amount for travel that normally would not be allowed. She suggested that they be able to do the project, with the local library assuming those costs. Barrett Memorial in Waterford has components that make it difficult, plus the score is a tie with the next two projects, that would result in more than can be accommodated by the UW. She recommends \$1050 less for Indianhead and \$325 from Winnebago, and fund through Winnebago (\$34,816 total).

#### *Digitization: Large Libraries*

Drew reported that the only project submitted in the category, Marathon County, is fine.

#### *Enhancing Use of Technology*

This is the formerly-known-as Innovative Technology grant. Many projects were submitted by library systems and are related to making the resources more available on mobile or handheld devices. The exception is SCLS, which hopes to carry out a digitization access project. Ripon was going to invest in e-books. Burlington had hoped to use technology to improve management of their internet access. Stainbrook wondered if there was a licensing issue with the Ripon project. Bocher said he could not recall. Johnson said there were a number of similar requests among the applicants but the amounts quoted from their vendors varied and she could not tell why. Bocher said he had a similar observation but it may be their size or population. Stainbrook wondered if some leveraging of the vendor might be possible. Johnson said there were two for Airpac Mobile, but one was \$6000 more.

#### *System Technology Projects*

Bocher said the category has continued for a number of years. He reviewed uses of the grant funds and said there is not much difference from the current projects. In some cases the funds will supplement broadband content or bandwidth. They purchase databases that are not included in the BadgerLink project.

#### *Multi-type Library Collaboration*

Howe said that two projects were proposed, one in South Central and one in Nicolet. The latter would conduct a summit for multi-type libraries. She noted that the comments were not particularly complementary, particularly since both systems already do a fairly considerable amount of multi-type collaboration. Stainbrook asked what the comment was for Nicolet. Howe said one reviewer wondered whether the project really deserved to be in this category, and there is no demonstrated benefit. For

SCLS, some of the implementation and decisions will already be made before the summit and it really seems more designed to acquire software.

#### *Joining Shared Automated Systems*

Bocher reviewed the four counties and noted that Waukesha and SCLS has the greatest numbers of new libraries that would be brought into the shared automated system. The other two system applicants, Indianhead and Wisconsin Valley, would bring in some smaller communities. A total of nine communities would be able to join the shared automated systems. In response to a question from Johnson, he said the grants are not ranked or scored.

Cross asked that the total populations be revealed to the committee. He read through the populations of the communities. Howe reminded the committee that they have the opportunity to recommend higher numbers than the preliminary budgets when they make motions tomorrow. Stainbrook said that only one application had populations and wondered if the cost-per-capita of \$2 reflects what would be allocated in earlier years.

Bocher said the Broadband grants would be for individual libraries while the system technology projects would address system-wide needs, or components at the head-end.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

#### **Wednesday, November 17**

Howe convened the committee at 8:35 and asked if there were follow-up questions from Wednesday.

Laughlin reported that she asked her staff about cancelling the Gale product they use to instead use Learning Express. She believes about 10 libraries in her system would be affected. That would save about \$4000 in their system alone. Brokering for databases is a service done by her system. She also commented about the delivery service and wondering what is being done about fuel, that perhaps an alternative fuel is used. Howe commented on age of vehicles, and Drew added information from the delivery committee. Stainbrook also commented on lack of availability of hybrid vehicles. She credited DeBacher with an innovative idea of used fryer oils. Drew said she would refer the idea to the group.

#### **Final Recommendations on Applications and Allocation of 2011 Funds**

Bocher and Cross explained the process.

Chevis moved; Seconded by Saecker - funding \$126,975 for LSTA Administration.

Chevis moved; Iverson seconded - all other library improvements for a total of \$408,450.

Sheehan moved; seconded by Johnson - digitization- large libraries. Unanimous approval with Erickson abstaining.

Kabler moved; seconded by Sheehan - Library Improvement Technology at recommended amount. Unanimous approval.

Chevis moved; Saecker seconded - Broadband upgrade amount at \$15,500. Unanimously approved.

Erickson moved; seconded by Saecker - Public Library System Technology Programs. Unanimous, Sheehan, Platteter and Langby abstained.



Chevis moved; Johnson seconded - Delivery Projects for 90,000. Unanimous with Sheehan abstaining.

Kabler moved; Sheehan seconded - WISCAT at requested amount.

Stainbrook said it is time to start phasing the service out since it is a duplication of services. This is an opportunity to move forward with other options. She wondered if she could offer a substitute motion. She offered a friendly amendment to keep the amount for the employees and benefits for one year, and another \$200,000 to run WISCAT for 6 months while other alternatives are investigated. This would transition Wisconsin off of WISCAT. Drew asked what other services would be used. OCLC or going directly to catalogs. Drew said there is no lower-cost program, that OCLC would be 10 times as expensive. Langby said lots of her libraries are too small to use OCLC. Platteter wondered if such a shift could be done in such short a time. Chevis asked Drew what percentages of libraries currently use OCLC. Howe asked for clarification on whether Drew was referring to just public libraries. Drew said some who had gone to OCLC could be reversed. She said they are working on making OCLC and WISCAT work together, but that she could not guess the percentage.

14 UW campuses and many, but not all academic colleges and some systems are using OCLC. Stainbrook commented that the number of ILLs beyond system level is a very small percentage, with systems providing much of it internally. Kiefer stated he is not sure we are at a point to make such a decision of such a large impact. We need to look for efficiencies. In the spirit of compromise, a group of staff and stakeholders take a look at creating efficiencies in structures so that a discussion could take place at the next stage. Stainbrook said she could withdraw her friendly amendment. Kiefer stated that the Division would be working with stakeholders to investigate efforts at greater efficiencies in ILL systems that are used. Laughlin wondered if "no" votes might have an impact on future decisions. Kiefer said members should vote as they deem fit. Steffan said that many of these issues were part of the discussion during the last process of contracting. She asked Drew when the contract expires. Drew said we have the power to talk to the Dept. of Administration (DOA) but that the current agreement ends at the end of 2011. Drew said no matter what the state does, there are some systems that will do otherwise if they have the resources. WISCAT levels the playing field. Erickson said that \$500,000 is a lot of money and wondered whether the libraries that use it couldn't simply pay more of the costs. He discussed what they have done at Marathon County and now have determined they must limit ILL. There were three dissenting votes to recommendation of funding the WISCAT amount. Erickson, Stainbrook, Laughlin. Otherwise it carried.

Stainbrook moved that Statewide Library Access and Virtual Reference be approved at the totals proposed. Laughlin said that she has a problem with Virtual Reference; that it is not necessary to be done with continuing grant money. Stainbrook wondered whether she wants the items to be separated. Laughlin stated she does not see the Statewide Card going anywhere, anyway, and the Milwaukee is already currently exempt. Cross asked if there is any interest in opening up the Milwaukee County border. Laughlin said no, and that there are some categories where there simply is not much enthusiasm for Statewide Library Access. Sheehan asked what would happen if the funding for the Access project is denied. Drew said it would be difficult and Kiefer said it would contradict what COLAND has requested. Drew said Virtual Reference would die January 1<sup>st</sup>. Stainbrook said she was at the summit and there was enthusiasm about the statewide library card, but she now hears about lots of challenges. She thinks the excitement is from outside the library community, from those who do not fully understand the issues. She is pleased with the work that has occurred. She said the virtual reference with the option of texting may open up more reference questions. Saecker said the Spanish option in AskAway will be a benefit for libraries that do not have resources to serve that population. Kiefer said these technologies are emerging and that they may help in the future with digital natives. Drew added comments about what libraries do and what should be provided or can be supported. Kiefer stated importance of staying relevant and moving forward. The motion carried unanimously with Laughlin dissenting.

Stainbrook moved; Chevis seconded - Resources for Libraries at the proposed amount.

Chevis moved Learning Express, seconded by Dawson at proposed amount. Unanimous no discussion.

Erickson recommended Digitization-Local Resources at \$34,816, which would accommodate the number of grants Drew had indicated. Unanimous with Langby abstaining.

Chevis moved the E-Book Summit & Content Learning at \$70,000 with Saecker seconded. Laughlin said that more than e-books are needed. E-music and other e-media should be included. Chevis suggested changing the name to e-resources. Laughlin suggested e-media. Kiefer said it might be Digital Content and the future of libraries. "E-Content" was agreed upon by consensus. Stainbrook said that \$70,000 may not be enough and she hoped for more funds. The motion carried unanimously.

Stainbrook moved \$70,000 in the Joining Shared Library Systems, to permit the two largest projects. Dawson seconded. The motion carried, with Langby abstaining.

A break was called at 9:30.

Howe asked for adjusted amounts to requests from Huntington.

Accessibility: \$93,108

Jobs: \$95,201

Literacy: \$87,041

Chevis moved, seconded by Dawson, Accessibility at \$93,108. Stainbrook asked for clarification on the Portage County project, whether they mention the number of people affected. Huntington said, no, it only indicates total population. The motion carried with Stainbrook opposed and abstentions from Sheehan and Langby.

Johnson moved \$99,843 for in the Enhanced Technology category, which would include the top 9 grants. Chevis seconded the motion. Saecker suggested that one more be accommodated since the next grant has a tied score. Johnson/Chevis amended the motion to \$114,093. The motion carried with abstentions from Platteter, Sheehan, Langby and Dawson. Bocher confirmed that another \$800 may be declined to the Brandon grant for salaries. Stainbrook asked if Bocher felt better about this category than the Innovative category. Bocher confirmed, and was surprised at the number that addressed handheld devices.

Chevis moved Literacy, supported by George, at the revised amount of \$87,401. There was no discussion. The motion carried unanimously, with Sheehan abstaining.

Johnson moved, second by Chevis, for the Jobs category at \$95,201. Chevis said that there was much discussion when this was proposed, but the requests came in substantially lower. Huntington thinks it is because it has become a competitive category instead of non-competitive system. DeBacher added that many smaller libraries are struggling with local operations and had no resources to apply, combined with Learning Express database now contracted at the state level. The motion carried unanimously with Dawson, Langby, Saecker, and Sheehan abstaining.

Chevis asked about funding the two other Joining Shared Systems; Stainbrook asked Bocher if a lower amount could be granted to those two categories. George noted that the category has been intended to be phased out and that it may be appropriate to the two other grants.

Chevis moved to fund the two remaining applicants with Platteter seconding. Amended amount would be \$145,500. The motion carried with Langby abstaining.

Stainbrook asked to reconsider the Portage County grant in the Accessibility category; that the grant should be denied, with the funds used toward a statewide problem. Laughlin seconded the motion.

Huntington explained the Loop technology and the recommendations for accessibility. She added that \$5000 is fairly typical for a Loop system cost. Despite De Bacher's confusion, there was no motion and no vote.

Chevis noted that in April, she will recommend that this category be either removed or tightened up, since these issues are a local municipal responsibility. She would like to see it limited to more specified services if it is to be continued. Huntington explained Accessibility category. Laughlin also commented.

Dawson suggested a portion of the remaining amount, recommending \$30,000, to the E-Content category, increasing it to \$100,000. Sheehan seconded. Langby suggested putting the balance of the amount, and Dawson/Sheehan amended his motion. There was no further discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Stainbrook suggested that in the spring, as other money is identified, it be applied to E-Content. Dawson seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Cross reminded the group that nothing is firm until the appropriation is released at the federal level.

Howe said that a sub-award grant reports required by IMLS will be required of Howe, so that all systems will be required to submit information to her. Drew asked for discussion on what sort of e-content would be desired or sought. Chevis asked whether the summit would better indicate the options. Drew said that work in anticipation of the summit may be required. Dawson said that the platform issue is important—whether iPad, Kindle, Nook, whatever. Drew asked to confirm that it is downloadable content for handheld devices, not just Web accessible. Stainbrook said that WPLC should be considered as a partner. Dawson wondered if ALA has a division working on it. Bocher commented that a motion was passed in June to establish an ALA group to investigate e-content, fair use, fair access, etc. ALA Technology also is focusing on the issue. Presumably the groups will meet at the Midwinter conference. He noted that a national perspective will be required, but he is concerned that ALA may not move fast enough. Kiefer asked whether other stakeholders should be involved. Drew said that all multi-type requirements cannot be met. Several felt that licensing can be challenging in the public and school libraries.

The group broke at 10:35 and re-convened at 10:50.

### **Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2012**

Howe invited the committee to suggest new ideas for the future.

Chevis suggested that e-content may be a needed category going forward, as a result of the Summit. She wondered when a summit would occur. Kiefer said planning is required and suggested that the first half of the year would be preferred.

Stainbrook wholeheartedly supports a statewide solution for e-content, but has concern that more and more of the LSTA grants go to statewide projects and less to individual library projects. She wonders whether the weak proposals or lack of proposals is because there is perception that there are too limited funds. Dawson noted that there is considerable effort not only in writing the grant, but of seeing it through to the end. He thinks that is particularly a concern to small libraries; Kabler concurred. Dawson asked whether library system technology projects could be bumped up in order to convey more to smaller libraries. Johnson concurred, noting that requests exceeded the budget. Dawson noted that he had referred to the non-competitive category.

Kiefer said that more shared resources related to virtual technology training resources. He had seen innovative projects and resources in some other states. These would be virtual spaces for the sharing of documents, training resources, or other "learning objects." He said that the agency is looking at new

content management at DPI and that some networking space may be an option within that framework. He said an event calendar, and that RL&LL is working on a training repository.

Chevis noted that WLA has talked repeatedly about new means for collaboration. She could see such a project that Kiefer discussed would be useful for their collaboration. Johnson noted that participation in some virtual forums she has participated in was underwhelming. Kiefer noted that it takes involvement and may take folding in the previous list-servs. Johnson said it might work better if they are scheduled times rather than asynchronous. Chevis mentioned Communities of Interest and other ideas from WLA. Saecker said that WLA also wants to be more nimble in being able to add more units for current or emerging issues. Kiefer said we will continue that conversation.

Stainbrook suggested that the oral history issue for digitization should be able to be accommodated within the category. Drew said that the guidelines could be adjusted, but had concern about opening up the whole category. Kabler suggested that video as well as audio may need to be accommodated. Drew distinguished between digitally created video and audio versus formats from some years ago. She also discussed the difficulty of digitizing and displaying newspapers.

Stainbrook doesn't want to lose accessibility altogether, but wonders if a survey of libraries could be conducted so that the retrofits could be offered, but then no longer. Huntington discussed the ongoing needs and also indicated that she maintains a map of libraries with ADA issues and she will work to make a 10-year comparison. Laughlin said it might be considered a "shame list" since her library also has an accessibility issue.

Becky George noted it is her last meeting, and that she would like to reiterate her desire to continue the multi-type category, and also to include schools in the literacy category. She thinks that more consideration should be given to schools and school libraries, and she thinks a multi-type category can help to continue expression of ideas. Discussion followed on where former LSTA committee members go to continue their involvement in LSTA.

Kiefer thanked the committee again for the incredible amount of work and the great level of dialog that has been offered. He thanked in particular the members whose terms have ended.

Langby suggested preliminary scheduling of the next meeting. Kiefer suggested sending out a doodle. Howe adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.